

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 681

HE 015 949

AUTHOR Gomberg, Irene L.; Atelsek, Frank J.
TITLE Financial Support for the Humanities: A Special Methodological Report.
INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Higher Education Panel.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.; National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.; National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ACE-HEP-56
PUB DATE Jan 83
CONTRACT SRS-8117037
GRANT OP-20027-81-2233
NOTE 43p.
AVAILABLE FROM Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Expenditures; *Federal Aid; *Financial Support; Higher Education; *Humanities; National Surveys; *Private Financial Support; *Research Methodology; Research Problems; Sample Size; State Aid; Statistical Analysis

ABSTRACT

Findings and methodological problems of a survey on financial support for humanities in higher education are discussed. Usable data were gathered from 351 of 671 Higher Education Panel member institutions. Two weighting methodologies were employed. The conventional method assumed that nonrespondents were similar to respondents, whereas a minimum-value method assumed that nonrespondents had no financial activity in the humanities to report. The conventional approach generated dollar estimates about 85 percent higher than those produced by the alternative approach. Respondents reported by source the total amount of gifts, grants, and contracts from government and private sources that were restricted to the humanities, along with the total amount of funds expended for the humanities from all sources. During fiscal year 1980, restricted income for the humanities ranged between \$130 and \$246 million. Two-fifths of this support came for the federal government, and more than one-fifth came from individuals. Humanities expenditures from all sources ranged between \$1.6 and \$2.9 billion, with instruction accounting for 8 of every 10 dollars spent. Ten percent of humanities expenditures were financed by government or private sources. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED226681

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE HUMANITIES: A SPECIAL METHODOLOGICAL REPORT

Irene L. Gomberg and Frank J. Atelsek

HE 015 949

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H.E. Panel Report
ACE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL REPORT NUMBER 56
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

JANUARY
1983

A Survey Funded by the National Science Foundation, the U. S. Department of Education,
and the National Endowment for the Humanities

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

J. W. Peltason, *President*

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.

The Higher Education Panel is a survey research program established by the Council for the purpose of securing policy-related information quickly from representative samples of colleges and universities. *Higher Education Panel Reports* are designed to expedite communication of the Panel's survey findings to policy-makers in government, in the associations, and in educational institutions across the nation.

The Higher Education Panel's surveys on behalf of the Federal Government are conducted under support provided jointly by the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the U.S. Department of Education (NSF Contract SRS-8117037 and NEH Grant OP-20027-81-2233).

STAFF OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL

Frank J. Atelsek, *Panel Director*

Irene L. Gomberg, *Assistant Director*

Charles Andersen, *Senior Staff Associate*

Clare McManus, *Research Assistant*

Bernard R. Greene, *Programmer*

Shirley B. Kahan, *Administrative Secretary*

HIEP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

W. Todd Furniss, *Director, Office of Academic Affairs, ACE, Chairman*

Michael J. Pelczar, Jr., *President, Council of Graduate Schools
in the United States*

Thomas Bartlett, *President, Association of American Universities*

D. F. Finn, *Executive Vice President, National Association of College
and University Business Officers*

James W. White, *Vice President for Membership and Financial Services,
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges*

FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Charles E. Falk, National Science Foundation, *Chairman*

Stanley F. Turesky, National Endowment for the Humanities

Salvatore Corrallo, U. S. Department of Education

Charles H. Dickens, National Science Foundation, *Secretary*

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Martin Frankel, National Center for Education Statistics, *Chairman*

Nancy M. Conlon, National Science Foundation

Jeffrey Thomas, National Endowment for the Humanities

Financial Support for the Humanities: A Special Methodological Report

Irene L. Gomberg
Frank J. Atelsek

Higher Education Panel Reports
Number 56 January 1983

American Council on Education
Washington, D.C. 20036

This material is based upon research supported by the National Science Foundation under contract #SRS-8117037, and by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Endowment for the Humanities under grant #OP-20027-81-2233. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsoring agencies.

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Background.....	1
Methodology.....	8
Range of Findings.....	14
Summary.....	19
Detailed Statistical Tables.....	21
Appendix	
A. Pretest Instructions.....	25
B. Survey Instructions.....	30

Acknowledgments

The survey on which this report is based was developed in the Office of Planning and Policy Assessment at the National Endowment for the Humanities. In particular we would like to thank Daniel Schechter, Arnita Jones, and Stanley Turesky of the Office's Evaluation and Assessment Studies Branch for their many contributions.

The Federal Advisory Board, its Technical Advisory Committee, and the Higher Education Panel Advisory Committee all provided valuable assistance and guidance in solving the unusual problems that arose with the study. We would like to make special mention of our statistical consultant, Joseph Steinberg of Survey Design, Inc., for his advice and recommendations; and Martin Frankel, Chairman of the Federal Advisory Board's Technical Advisory Committee, for preparing the methodology section of this report.

As always, however, our special thanks go to our campus representatives for their continued support of this survey program.

Financial Support for the Humanities: A Special Methodological Report

Background

Since 1971, the American Council on Education has operated the Higher Education Panel, a survey mechanism designed to collect and disseminate data on current policy issues affecting the nation's colleges and universities. The Panel's function is to gather information that is readily accessible but not available from other sources. Consequently, the Panel has enjoyed a high degree of cooperation from its member institutions, with response rates typically reaching 85 percent.

A Panel study proceeds in several phases. A questionnaire is designed and tested, then the survey is mailed in final form to the appropriate Panel institutions. After a predetermined period of time, or when a sufficient response level has been obtained, the field phase is concluded. Survey responses are statistically adjusted to represent the entire population of colleges and universities, and then a descriptive report is written and widely distributed.

The survey upon which this report is based was atypical--it achieved a response rate of only 52 percent even after extraordinary and lengthy follow-up efforts. In light of the difficulty in obtaining these data, it was determined that special methods needed to be employed, both in presenting and interpreting the results. Thus, this document is more a report on methodology than a descriptive analysis of the survey findings.

Sponsor Interest in Financial Data

In June 1981, President Reagan called for the creation of a special Task Force on the Arts and the Humanities and asked it to recommend ways of

increasing private sector support for the arts and humanities. In response to this charge, the National Endowment for the Humanities has begun to assemble information on the financial base of the humanities in the United States.

A Panel survey was needed because existing data sources (e.g., records of the Foundation Center on private giving, studies by the Council for Financial Aid to Education, and the National Center for Education Statistics' higher education finance surveys) do not separate the humanities from other fields of academic activity. The Endowment defines the humanities to include languages, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; and the history, theory, and criticism of the arts. The lack of comprehensive and reliable data about support for the humanities is particularly acute in the area of higher education, where the Endowment's greatest program support has been channeled. This Higher Education Panel survey was to provide the first systematic data on humanities support in higher education.

Description of the Higher Education Panel

The Higher Education Panel provides the basis for a continuing survey research program begun in 1971 by the American Council on Education to conduct specialized surveys on topics of current policy interest to the higher education community and to the federal government. It has been supported principally by a combination of grants and contracts from three federal agencies--currently the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The Panel is a disproportionate stratified sample of 760 colleges and universities drawn from the population of more than 3,000 higher education institutions listed in the National Center for Education Statistics' Education

Directory. All institutions in this population are grouped in terms of the Panel's stratification design, which is based chiefly upon control (public, private), type (university, four-year college, two-year college), and size (full-time-equivalent enrollment). For any given survey, either the entire Panel or an appropriate subset is used.

The survey operation is dependent upon a network of campus representatives at the Panel institutions that (through their presidents) have agreed to participate. The representatives receive the Panel questionnaires and direct them to the most appropriate campus officials for response.

Survey Development

In October 1981, the Panel staff pretested a survey instrument in a matrix format developed by the Endowment that attempted to track the sources and uses of restricted funds expended for the humanities during a one-year period. That is, respondents were asked to trace the use of each dollar of humanities income from each funding source, as depicted in figure 1. (The instructions for completing the draft survey instrument are attached as Appendix A.) The income to be reported in the matrix was to be limited to external funds restricted solely or principally to the humanities.

The pretest revealed two insurmountable obstacles to completing the source-use matrix: (1) Most institutions tend to classify gifts, grants, and contracts by source of funds, not by use; thus, expenditures could not be traced back to their funding source. (2) Not all of the required information was centrally located; therefore, the cooperation of several different offices and departments would be required. This being the case, the larger institutions that receive a sizable amount of restricted humanities support would find it extremely difficult to respond.

Figure 1

American Council on Education
Higher Education Panel Survey No. 56

RESTRICTED SUPPORT FOR THE HUMANITIES
FISCAL YEAR 1980

Line No.	Source Use	Individuals		Foundations (3)	Government		Business (6)	Religious (7)	Foreign (8)	Other (9)
		Alumni (1)	Non-Alumni (2)		Federal (4)	State/Local (5)				
1	Faculty									
2	Research									
3	Museum & Library Collection Acquisition									
4	Museum & Library Cataloging and Preservation									
5	Museum & Library Exhibits									
6	Museum & Library: Other									
7	Curriculum Development and Implementation									
8	Student Support									
9	Scholarly Publication									
10	Public Service Programming									
11	TV/Radio									
12	Capital Expenditures									
13	Other									

Figure 2

OMB No. 3145-0009
exp. 6/30/84

Humanities includes: language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts (see instructions for more complete definition).

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Higher Education Panel Survey No. 56
Financial Support for the Humanities, FY 1980

I. Income Restricted to the Humanities		II. Humanities Expenditures from Restricted and Unrestricted Funds				
Please report below, by source, the total amount of gifts, grants, and contracts from government and private sources that were pledged or received during fiscal 1980 RESTRICTED TO THE HUMANITIES:		Please report in Column A below, by use, the total amount of funds expended FOR THE HUMANITIES during fiscal 1980 from all sources. Also, for each different expenditure line, estimate the proportion of support that was provided by each of the listed funding sources.				
Source of Funds	Amount Pledged or Received	Use of Funds	Amount Expended for the Humanities From All Sources	Estimated Percentage of Humanities Support Provided by:		
			(A)	(B) Government and Private Support Restricted to the Humanities	(C) All Other Government and Private Support ¹	(D) All Other Sources ²
[For each line, the sum of columns B, C, and D should equal 100%]						
Individuals:		(1) Humanities instruction	\$ _____	100% = _____ %	+ _____ %	+ _____ %
(1) Alumni	\$ _____	(2) Humanities research	_____	100% = _____	+ _____	+ _____
(2) Nonalumni	_____	(3) Humanities libraries: noncapital	_____	100% = _____	+ _____	+ _____
(3) Foundations	_____	(4) Humanities museums: noncapital	_____	100% = _____	+ _____	+ _____
Government:		(5) Humanities graduate student scholarships and fellowships	_____	100% = _____	+ _____	+ _____
(4) Federal	_____	(6) Humanities capital expenditures	_____	100% = _____	+ _____	+ _____
(5) State or local	_____	(7) Humanities public service and media	_____	100% = _____	+ _____	+ _____
(6) Businesses	_____	(8) All other humanities expenditures	_____	100% = _____	+ _____	+ _____
(7) Religious organizations	_____	(9) Total	\$ _____	100% = _____	+ _____	+ _____
(8) Foreign governments or organizations	_____					
(9) Other	_____					
(10) Total	\$ _____					

¹Includes gifts, grants and contracts from governmental or private organizations or individuals.
²Includes tuition and fees, endowment income, state appropriations, etc.

Thank you for your assistance. Please return this form by April 9, 1982 to:

Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

If you have any questions or problems, please call the HEP staff collect at (202) 833-4757

Please keep a copy of this survey for your records.
Person completing form:

Name _____

Dept. _____ Phone _____

As a result of these findings, the survey instrument was revised by separating source dollars from use dollars. Although the requested source information was still to be limited to funds restricted to the humanities, the use information was to include unrestricted as well as restricted funds.

A field test of the revised questionnaire was conducted in January 1982. All of the contacted representatives reported that they could provide good estimates of restricted income, but estimates of certain line item expenditures would be very difficult to provide, as would sources of support for these expenditures. However, in view of the importance of the information to be gathered, the sponsor was hopeful that a large majority of Panel institutions would be willing to cooperate in this unusually demanding survey.

Survey Response

The survey instrument (figure 2; see Appendix B for full instructions and definitions) was mailed on March 17, 1982, to all Panel members except independent medical schools and institutions with no full-time humanities faculty. Although the field test results had suggested there might be a problem with institutions not responding fully or at all, the problem turned out to be more significant than anticipated--chiefly because humanities expenditures were difficult to separate from all expenditures.

By the fourth week after the survey had been mailed--when the response rate for the average HEP survey normally reaches about 50 percent--only 15 percent of the survey group had responded. After two mail follow-ups, completed 10 weeks after the first mailing, the rate rose only to 38 percent (table A). After three telephone follow-up campaigns completed 16 weeks after the first mailing, the rate stood at 50 percent. By the time the field phase was closed and the survey data were processed, usable data had been obtained from 351, or 52 percent, of the 671 institutions in the eligible survey group.

Inasmuch as Panel survey response rates generally reach between 80 and 90 percent, the 52 percent rate was considered unacceptable by Panel standards and evidence of the need for special treatment of this study.

Table A: Cumulative Response Rates at Various Points After Survey Mailout
(in percentages)

	Cumulative Response Rate (N=351)
At due date (3.5 weeks)	11
At first mail follow-up (5.5 weeks)	21
At second mail follow-up (9.5 weeks)	37
At first telephone follow-up (10 weeks)	38
At second telephone follow-up (12 weeks)	43
At third telephone follow-up (14 weeks)	46
At close of field phase (18 weeks)	52

There was concern about the possibility that, as a result of repeated follow-up activities, the institutions that responded early were significantly different from the institutions that responded late. Table B compares 251 early survey respondents (from first mailing to the time of the second mail follow-up) with 100 late respondents (from the second mail follow-up to the close of the field phase).

Early responses came from a higher proportion of universities, both public and private; public four-year colleges, both large and small; the larger private four-year colleges; and private two-year colleges. Late responses came from a greater proportion of the smaller private four-year colleges and of the public two-year colleges, large and small. Although a greater proportion of early respondents tended to be the somewhat larger institutions and a greater proportion of the late respondents tended to be smaller, none of the observed differences seems significant enough to warrant any concern.

Table B: Comparison of Early Respondents with Late Respondents

<u>Institution Type</u>	Percentage Distribution of Early Respondents (N=251)	Percentage Distribution of Late Respondents (N=100)
Public universities	21.4	20.0
Private universities	10.8	9.0
Public four-year: large black	.8	2.0
large nonblack	14.6	12.0
medium	7.6	3.0
small	6.8	3.0
Private four-year: large	1.2	1.0
medium	4.8	2.0
small	5.2	10.0
smaller	1.6	5.0
Public two-year: large	3.2	7.0
medium	5.6	5.0
small	4.0	8.0
smaller	5.2	6.0
smallest	6.0	7.0
Private two-year	1.2	0
Total	100.0	100.0

Methodology

HEP surveys usually remain in the field until an acceptable response rate is obtained. National estimates are then generated, normally using a standard institutional weighting procedure. By this procedure, a weight is calculated, separately for each stratification cell, by dividing the number of institutions in the population by the number of institutions in the Panel that responded to the survey. The appropriate weight is then applied to the responses given by each institution. In this way, Panel survey results represent the entire population of eligible institutions, not just the number that responded.

Weighting of Responses

As mentioned above, only a small number of institutions responded initially to this survey, and even after extensive follow-up efforts, only 52 percent of the institutions in the Panel responded. As a result, point

estimates with corresponding standard errors of estimates cannot be shown as is normally done. In other Panel surveys, when nonrespondents typically account for only 10 or 15 percent of the entire Panel, the assumption is made that for each stratification cell, the nonrespondents are very similar to the respondents. However, in this survey, the nonrespondents are nearly as numerous as the respondents, so to assume such similarity would be unwarranted. Thus, a special weighting process for this survey was deemed necessary. At the recommendation of the Higher Education Panel's Federal Advisory Board, the HEP staff conferred with Joseph Steinberg, the Panel's statistical consultant. He recommended reporting a range of survey results based upon two alternative assumptions about the cause of noncooperation in the survey.

The first assumption was that nonrespondents had little or no humanities activity. In keeping with this minimum-value view, all nonrespondents were treated as if they had returned their survey forms with a response of zero for each item. National estimates were then calculated as if there had been a 100 percent response rate. The resulting estimates indicate the minimum income and expenditure amounts for the humanities in higher education institutions.

The second assumption reflected the conventional approach to weighting. Nonrespondents and respondents were assumed to be very similar within each stratification cell. Therefore, survey responses were adjusted to develop national estimates in two stages. The first stage weighted responses within each cell for institutional nonresponse. The second stage adjusted the Panel data to represent the entire population. This set of illustrative estimates provides a much higher estimate of the financial base of humanities than the first set. Table C shows the weights generated by the two different approaches.

Table C: Stratification Design and Weights

Cell	Description	Population	Panel	Respondents	Conventional Weight	Minimum-Value Weight
01	Public university	112	110	74	1.51	1.02
02	Private university	71	70	36	1.97	1.01
04	Public black four-year (large)	12	11	4	3.00	1.09
05	Public nonblack four-year (large)	100	88	49	2.04	1.14
07	Private four-year (large)	11	10	4	2.75	1.10
08	Public two-year (large)	36	34	15	2.40	1.06
09	Public four-year (medium)	75	41	22	3.41	1.83
10	Public four-year (small)	159	34	20	7.95	4.68
11	Private four-year (medium)	119	38	14	8.50	3.13
12	Private four-year (small)	255	41	23	11.09	6.22
13	Private four-year (smaller)	466	27	9	51.78	17.26
14	Public two-year (medium)	62	36	19	3.26	1.72
15	Public two-year (small)	102	41	18	5.67	2.49
16	Public two-year (smaller)	171	38	19	9.00	4.50
17	Public two-year (smallest)	433	38	22	19.68	11.39
18	Private two-year	197	14	3	65.67	14.07
	Total	(2381)	(671)	(351)		

Response Analysis

The rate of response to this survey varied widely according to different institutional characteristics. As shown in table D, higher-than-average response rates were recorded for the large institutions, particularly the universities (59 percent). Doctoral-granting institutions and public universities had especially high response rates (68 percent and 67 percent, respectively), as did institutions with high enrollments (62 percent of those with more than 10,000 total enrollment, and 64 percent of those with more than 10,000 full-time-equivalent enrollment). Along these lines, respondents accounted for 59 percent of institutions with at least \$50 million in educational and general (E&G) expenditures.

Lower-than-average response rates were recorded for the smaller institutions, especially institutions in the private sector (44 percent). Private two-year colleges had the lowest response rate--only 21 percent--and the rate for private four-year colleges was 43 percent. Sorting the respondents according to the Carnegie classes, the liberal arts and specialized

Table D: Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

Characteristic	Respondents (N=351)	Nonrespondents (N=320)	Response Rate
Total	100.0	100.0	52.3
Control			
Public	75.2	65.9	55.6
Private	24.8	34.1	44.4
Type			
University	25.9	20.0	58.7
Four-year college	46.7	47.5	51.9
Two-year college	27.4	32.5	48.0
Type and Control			
Public university	22.1	11.2	67.3
Private university	10.3	10.6	51.4
Public four-year college	27.1	24.7	54.6
Private four-year college	14.2	20.6	43.1
Public two-year college	26.5	29.5	49.7
Private two-year college	.8	3.4	21.4
Carnegie Classification			
Research university	14.2	14.1	52.6
Doctoral-granting institution	15.9	18.2	68.3
Comprehensive college and university	36.2	34.1	53.8
Liberal arts college	5.4	10.0	37.3
Two-year college	27.4	32.5	48.0
Specialized institution	.9	1.2	42.9
Census Region			
East	23.9	26.3	50.0
Midwest	25.6	21.6	56.6
South	31.3	27.6	55.6
West	19.1	24.5	46.2
Total Enrollment			
Less than 2,000	19.9	25.0	46.7
2,000-5,999	30.8	30.9	52.2
6,000-9,999	20.8	24.7	48.0
10,000 or more	28.5	19.4	61.7
Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment			
Less than 2,000	24.5	29.4	47.8
2,000-5,999	33.3	38.4	48.8
6,000-9,999	21.1	19.1	54.8
10,000 or more	21.1	13.1	63.8
Educational and General Expenditures			
Less than \$5 million	20.5	22.5	50.0
\$5-9.9 million	15.7	20.0	46.2
\$10-14.9 million	9.7	12.8	45.3
\$15-19.9 million	12.0	10.3	56.0
\$20-24.9 million	7.7	6.9	55.1
\$25-49.9 million	16.5	13.8	56.9
\$50 million or more	18.0	13.8	58.9

institutions had the poorest response rates (37 percent and 43 percent, respectively).

Institutions with fewer than 2,000 students enrolled and with E&G expenditures between \$5 million and \$15 million also had low response rates (47 percent and about 46 percent, respectively).

Respondents more frequently were publicly controlled, universities, with more than 10,000 students and more than \$15 million in E&G expenditures. In contrast, nonrespondents were more apt to be private, two-year or liberal arts colleges, with fewer than 2,000 students and E&G expenditures of less than \$15 million.

Credit Hour Comparison

To provide another view of the survey's response pattern, and in order to determine whether respondents had a significantly higher involvement in the humanities than nonrespondents, a comparison was made of each institution's

Table E: Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents
by Humanities Credit Hours*

Cell	Description	Average Humanities Credit Hours		Humanities Credit Hours as a Percentage of Combined Science, Engineering, and Humanities Credit Hours	
		Respondents	Nonrespondents	Respondents	Nonrespondents
01	Public university	34,579	34,108	24.2	22.8
02	Private university	14,548	39,000	26.7	29.7
04	Public black four-year (large)	7,939	15,172	31.0	29.1
05	Public nonblack four-year (large)	22,955	20,760	26.8	27.3
07	Private four-year (large)	12,844	12,182	36.8	24.0
08	Public two-year (large)	25,038	29,036	28.8	29.1
09	Public four-year (medium)	12,478	10,934	28.4	26.7
10	Public four-year (small)	6,092	6,391	32.2	32.8
11	Private four-year (medium)	2,661	6,783	37.8	33.1
12	Private four-year (small)	4,020	2,732	35.1	33.6
13	Private four-year (smaller)	2,155	2,026	43.3	38.9
14	Public two-year (medium)	13,981	12,384	27.1	29.1
15	Public two-year (small)	11,613	11,064	30.7	30.4
16	Public two-year (smaller)	15,202	7,879	44.9	29.6
17	Public two-year (smallest)	2,052	7,806	30.6	45.7
18	Private two-year	771	1,864	25.1	35.7

*Data taken from Undergraduate Student Credit Hours in Science, Engineering, and the Humanities, Fall 1980, Higher Education Panel Report Number 54, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., June 1982.

response to a recent Panel survey on student credit hours in the sciences, engineering, and the humanities (HEP Report #54). Credit hours were summed for institutions that responded to the present survey and for institutions that did not respond, separately for each stratification cell. Similarly, credit hours in the humanities were expressed as a percentage of the sum of humanities, science, and engineering credit hours (see table E). The results of such an analysis were inconclusive, inasmuch as no clear pattern of humanities involvement emerged.

A Note of Caution

The wide range of dollar values provided by the two sets of estimates generated by the different weighting methodologies illustrates the great degree of uncertainty that must be considered in using any of the results of this survey. Moreover, since some of the institutional weights are quite large, particularly in the smaller cells, it should be recognized that one data item on one questionnaire could have an exaggerated impact on the results. For example, of the 96 two-year college respondents, only one accounted for 9 of every 10 restricted income dollars from individuals and for more than three-fourths of restricted income from all sources. On a weighted basis, this public two-year college represented more than half the total income estimated by the conventional method and more than two-thirds estimated by the minimum-value method. Thus, this may be the reason that the percentage of restricted income at two-year colleges derived from individuals is so high (see text table G).

It should be noted also that not all institutions provided complete information. Missing values on a questionnaire were replaced by cell averages, and thus in some instances the actual weights are even higher than those listed in table C.

Range of Findings

As stated earlier, the two alternate weighting methodologies produced significant variations in survey findings. The conventional method assumed that nonrespondents were similar to respondents, whereas the minimum-value method assumed that nonrespondents--unlike respondents--had no financial activity in the humanities to report.

There is no sure way of determining where the actual values lie; however, the minimum value estimates can be considered with confidence to be the floor, with the actual values lying somewhere above them. Since the accuracy of the conventional estimates is not known, the minimum-value estimates are provided as a point of reference.

Overall, the dollar estimates generated by the conventional approach were about 85 percent higher than those generated by the minimum-value approach. This differential varied according to the level of response among each of the institutional categories. For example, public institutions had a higher than average response rate and their conventional estimates were about 65 percent higher than their minimum-value estimates. In contrast, private institutions had a lower than average response rate and their conventional estimates were about 120 percent higher.

Interestingly, the two methodologies produced very slight differences in the percentage distribution of dollars. This resulted from two significant factors. First, over 80 percent of the dollars were reported by institutions in the certainty cells (01-08). Furthermore, universities (cells 01 and 02) accounted for 78 percent of all reported income and 62 percent of all reported expenditures. Institutions in the certainty cells are self-representing; that is, all institutions fitting the cell description were asked to participate in

the Panel. In contrast, only a sample of institutions in each of the probability cells (09-18) was asked to participate.

Second, the certainty cells had the lowest weights and the smallest relative differences between their conventional weights and minimum-value weights. Thus, with the large dollar amounts coming from a few cells with low weights, and the small dollar amounts coming from the remaining cells with high weights, the method of calculating the weight--by either conventional or minimum-value method--had no significant impact on the inherent stability of the numbers.

Moreover, this phenomenon suggests that, although the dollar estimates are of uncertain accuracy, it is likely that the percentage distributions are a fairly accurate representation.

Restricted Humanities Income

In part I of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to report, by source, the total amount of gifts, grants, and contracts from government and private sources that were pledged or received during fiscal year 1980 and restricted to the humanities. As shown in table F, the conventional weighting

Table F: Comparison of FY1980 Income Restricted to the Humanities
According to Two Weighting Methodologies
(\$ in 000s)

	Conventional Methodology (C)	Minimum-Value Methodology (MV)	% Difference (C-MV/MV)
All institutions	\$245,768	\$129,827	89
Public institutions	94,330	57,930	63
Private institutions	151,438	71,897	111
Universities	120,574	70,744	70
Four-year colleges	101,836	50,079	103
Two-year colleges	23,358	9,004	159

process generated a \$246 million estimate of restricted humanities income--an amount 89 percent greater than the \$130 million estimated by the minimum-value method. Private institutions received three-fifths of all reported income restricted to the humanities, and public institutions, two-fifths. Universities accounted for nearly half of all such funds, and two-year colleges for under one-tenth.

Overall, the federal government provided 4 of every 10 restricted humanities dollars, and individuals (alumni and nonalumni) provided 2 of every 10 dollars (table G). Foundations accounted for 11 percent of the total, state

Table G: Percentage Distribution of Sources of FY1980 Restricted Humanities Income
(Conventional Methodology)

Source	Total	Public	Private	Univer- sities	Four-Year	Two-Year
Federal government	39	46	34	46	36	16
Nonalumni	12	8	15	9	9	40+
Alumni	11	10	11	7	10	31+
Foundations	11	7	13	17	5	4
State/local government	7	15	2	6	8	5
Religious organizations	6	*	10	1	14	0
Businesses	6	5	6	6	6	4
Foreign governments	1	3	*	2	1	*
Other	8	7	9	7	11	*
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Less than 0.5 percent

+See cautionary note on page 13.

Note: Totals may not add exactly because of rounding.

and local governments for 7 percent, religious organizations for 6 percent, businesses for 6 percent, foreign governments and organizations for 1 percent, with the remaining 8 percent coming from other sources.

Public institutions had a significantly larger proportion of restricted government support than did private institutions (61 percent vs. 36 percent).

On the other hand, private institutions received a substantially greater proportion of support from foundations and religious organizations (13 percent vs. 7 percent, and 10 percent vs. less than .5 percent, respectively).

These proportions differed also by type of institution. Foundations contributed a sizable share of support to universities (17 percent), whereas religious organizations provided significant support to four-year colleges (14 percent).

Humanities Expenditures

In part II of the survey, institutions were asked to report, by use, the total amount of funds expended for the humanities during fiscal year 1980 from all sources. They were also asked to estimate, for each different type of expenditure, the proportion of support that was provided by restricted government and private support, by all other government and private support, and by all other sources. State appropriations were to be counted under "all other."

As is shown in table H, total humanities expenditures from all sources amounted to \$2.9 billion by the conventional procedure and only \$1.6 billion by

Table H: A Comparison of FY1980 Humanities Expenditures According to Two Weighting Methodologies
(\$ in 000s)

	Conventional Methodology (C)	Minimum-Value Methodology (MV)	% Difference (C-MV/MV)
All institutions	\$2,904,084	\$1,572,127	85
Public institutions	1,958,368	1,149,643	70
Private institutions	945,716	422,484	124
Universities	1,138,207	704,789	61
Four-year colleges	1,274,800	634,352	101
Two-year colleges	491,076	232,986	111

the minimum-value procedure. Public institutions (which enroll about three-fourths of all students) accounted for two-thirds, and private institutions accounted for one-third, of all reported expenditures in the humanities.

The majority of expense was attributable to instructional costs, which accounted for 8 of every 10 dollars spent (see table I). That proportion ranged from 76 percent at the universities and 90 percent at the two-year colleges. Capital expenditures were the next most frequent use of funds, representing 6 percent of all institutions' expenditures for the humanities, but as much as 12 percent of the four-year colleges' expenditures during 1980.

Table I: Percentage Distribution of FY80 Humanities Expenditures
From All Sources
(Conventional Methodology)

<u>Use</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Univer- sities</u>	<u>Four-Year</u>	<u>Two-Year</u>
Instruction	80	82	77	76	80	90
Capital expenditures	6	8	3	1	12	4
Libraries	5	3	7	7	3	3
Research	2	3	2	5	1	*
Fellowships	2	1	4	4	*	0
Public service	1	1	1	1	1	*
Museums	1	1	1	1	*	*
Other	3	2	5	4	3	2
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

*Less than 0.5 percent

Note: Totals may not add exactly because of rounding.

Only one-tenth of all funds spent for the humanities came from government or private donors. Ninety percent of all support came from tuition and fees, state appropriations, endowment income, and other forms of institutional funding. The variations that occurred among different types of institutions are shown in table J.

Table J: Sources of Support for FY1980 Humanities Expenditures
(Conventional Methodology)

	<u>Restricted Government & Private Support</u>	<u>Other Government & Private Support</u>	<u>All Other Support</u>
All institutions	7	3	90
Public institutions	9	2	89
Private institutions	4	4	92
Universities	7	5	88
Four-year colleges	9	2	89
Two-year colleges	4	2	94

Summary

Because of the unusually low response to this Panel survey, two separate weighting methodologies were employed. The first assumed that survey nonrespondents were similar to respondents, and the second assumed that nonrespondents had no financial activity in the humanities to report.

During fiscal year 1980, restricted income for the humanities in the nation's colleges and universities ranged between \$130 million and \$246 million. Two-fifths of this support came from the federal government, and more than one-fifth came from individuals. Humanities expenditures from all sources ranged between \$1.6 billion and \$2.9 billion, with instruction accounting for 8 of every 10 dollars spent. Only 10 percent of humanities expenditures were financed by government or private sources.

Detailed Statistical Tables

Table 1

Alternate Estimates of FY 80 Income Restricted to the Humanities, by Source and Institutional Control

(Dollars in Thousands)

Source of Funds	Total (N=2,381)				Public (N=1,262)				Private (N=1,119)			
	Conventional		Minimum-Value		Conventional		Minimum-Value		Conventional		Minimum-Value	
	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%
Alumni	26,063	10.6	13,082	10.1	9,183	9.7	4,893	8.4	16,880	11.1	8,189	11.4
Nonalumni	29,995	12.2	13,561	10.4	7,891	8.4	4,706	8.1	22,104	14.6	8,855	12.3
Foundations	26,393	10.7	14,179	10.9	6,242	6.6	3,940	6.8	20,152	13.3	10,239	14.2
Federal government	95,246	38.8	51,128	39.4	43,489	46.1	27,348	47.2	51,758	34.2	23,780	33.1
State/local governments	16,707	6.8	9,705	7.5	13,915	14.8	8,365	14.4	2,792	1.8	1,340	1.9
Business	13,484	5.5	6,866	5.3	4,559	4.8	2,829	4.9	8,925	5.9	4,038	5.6
Religious organizations	15,400	6.3	8,612	6.6	103	.1	67	.1	15,298	10.1	8,546	11.9
Foreign governments	2,796	1.1	1,784	1.4	2,559	2.7	1,665	2.9	237	.2	119	.2
Other	19,683	8.0	10,909	8.4	6,391	6.8	4,117	7.1	13,292	8.8	6,791	9.4
Total	245,768	100.0	129,827	100.0	94,330	100.0	57,930	100.0	151,438	100.0	71,897	100.0

Note: On this and subsequent tables, numbers may not add exactly to totals because of weighting and rounding.

Table 2

Alternate Estimates of FY 80 Income Restricted to the Humanities, by Source and Institutional Type

(Dollars in Thousands)

Source of Funds	Universities (N=183)				Four-Year Colleges (N=1,197)				Two-Year Colleges (N=1,001)			
	Conventional		Minimum-Value		Conventional		Minimum-Value		Conventional		Minimum-Value	
	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%
Alumni	8,850	7.3	4,816	6.8	9,972	9.8	4,645	9.3	7,241	31.0	3,621	40.2*
Nonalumni	11,115	9.2	6,360	9.0	9,468	9.3	4,409	8.8	9,412	40.3	2,793	31.0*
Foundations	20,106	16.7	11,024	15.6	5,383	5.3	2,808	5.6	904	3.9	347	3.9
Federal government	55,285	45.9	33,102	46.8	36,333	35.7	16,865	33.7	3,628	15.5	1,161	12.9
State/local governments	7,330	6.1	4,607	6.5	8,185	8.0	4,504	9.0	1,193	5.1	594	6.6
Business	6,789	5.6	3,972	5.6	5,780	5.7	2,436	4.9	915	3.9	458	5.1
Religious organizations	710	.6	379	.5	14,690	14.4	8,234	16.4	0	0	0	0
Foreign governments	2,250	1.9	1,484	2.1	514	.5	283	.6	33	.1	17	.2
Other	8,140	6.8	5,000	7.1	11,512	11.3	5,895	11.8	31	.1	14	.2
Total	120,574	100.0	70,744	100.0	101,836	100.0	50,079	100.0	23,358	100.0	9,004	100.0

*See cautionary note on page 13.

Table 3

Alternate Estimates of FY 80 Humanities Expenditures From All Sources, by Use and Institutional Control

(Dollars in Thousands)

Use of funds	Total (N=2,381)				Public (N=1,262)				Private (N=1,119)			
	Conventional		Minimum-Value		Conventional		Minimum-Value		Conventional		Minimum-Value	
	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%
Instruction	2,327,874	80.2	1,254,756	79.8	1,596,600	81.5	934,841	81.3	731,275	77.3	319,915	75.7
Research	72,205	2.5	44,019	2.8	52,575	2.7	34,335	3.0	19,629	2.1	9,684	2.3
Libraries	133,214	4.6	71,410	4.5	65,792	3.4	40,705	3.5	67,422	7.1	30,705	7.3
Museums	16,740	.6	10,043	.6	10,101	.5	6,689	.6	6,639	.7	3,354	.8
Fellowships	55,295	1.9	30,933	2.0	20,165	1.0	13,117	1.1	35,130	3.7	17,815	4.2
Capital expenditures	181,787	6.3	101,009	6.4	154,932	7.9	86,815	7.6	26,855	2.8	14,194	3.4
Public service	29,547	1.0	16,974	1.1	20,237	1.0	12,346	1.1	9,310	1.0	4,628	1.1
Other	87,421	3.0	44,299	2.8	37,966	1.9	21,942	1.9	49,455	5.2	22,357	5.3
Total	2,904,084	100.0	1,572,127	100.0	1,958,368	100.0	1,149,643	100.0	945,716	100.0	422,484	100.0

Table 4

Alternate Estimates of FY 80 Humanities Expenditures From All Sources, by Use and Institutional Type

(Dollars in Thousands)

Use of Funds	Universities (N=183)				Four-Year Colleges (N=1,197)				Two-Year Colleges (N=1,001)			
	Conventional		Minimum-Value		Conventional		Minimum-Value		Conventional		Minimum-Value	
	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%	Estimate	%
Instruction	869,687	76.4	546,941	77.6	1,014,722	79.6	498,096	78.5	443,465	90.3	209,719	90.0
Research	58,134	5.1	36,831	5.2	13,737	1.1	7,036	1.1	334	.1	152	.1
Libraries	77,403	6.8	45,589	6.5	38,899	3.1	18,400	2.9	16,912	3.4	7,421	3.2
Museums	14,885	1.3	9,122	1.3	1,696	.1	841	.1	159	*	80	*
Fellowships	49,888	4.4	28,311	4.0	5,407	.4	2,622	.4	0	0	0	0
Capital expenditures	12,228	1.1	6,892	1.0	150,162	11.8	83,871	13.2	19,397	3.9	10,247	4.4
Public service	15,288	1.3	9,592	1.4	12,191	1.0	6,324	1.0	2,069	.4	1,058	.5
Other	40,693	3.6	22,827	3.2	37,987	3.0	17,161	2.7	8,741	1.8	4,310	1.8
Total	1,138,207	100.0	704,789	100.0	1,274,800	100.0	634,352	100.0	491,076	100.0	232,986	100.0

*Less than .05 percent

Table 5

Alternate Estimates of FY80 Humanities Expenditures, by Use and Source:
All Institutions (N=2,381)

(Dollars in Thousands)

Use of Funds	Total		Restricted Government & Private	All Other Government & Private	All Other
	\$	%			
CONVENTIONAL ESTIMATE					
Instruction	2,327,874	100.0	1.6	1.7	96.7
Research	72,205	100.0	55.8	12.0	32.3
Libraries	133,214	100.0	4.2	4.9	90.9
Museums	16,740	100.0	17.7	12.8	69.5
Fellowships	55,295	100.0	11.4	7.0	81.6
Capital expenditures	181,787	100.0	57.9	5.9	36.1
Public service	29,547	100.0	29.6	13.1	57.3
Other	87,421	100.0	4.8	12.8	82.4
Total	2,904,084	100.0	7.3	3.0	89.7
MINIMUM-VALUE ESTIMATE					
Instruction	1,254,756	100.0	1.7	1.8	96.5
Research	44,019	100.0	55.7	12.3	32.0
Libraries	71,410	100.0	4.0	4.6	91.4
Museums	10,043	100.0	17.3	12.3	70.4
Fellowships	30,933	100.0	11.9	6.7	81.4
Capital expenditures	101,009	100.0	57.7	5.7	36.6
Public service	16,974	100.0	29.9	12.2	57.9
Other	44,299	100.0	5.9	14.4	79.8
Total	1,572,127	100.0	7.7	3.1	89.3

Table 6

Alternate Estimates of FY80 Humanities Expenditures, by Use and Source:
Public Institutions (N=1,262)

(Dollars in Thousands)

Use of Funds	Total		Restricted Government & Private	All Other Government & Private	All Other
	\$	%			
CONVENTIONAL ESTIMATE					
Instruction	1,596,600	100.0	1.3	1.6	97.0
Research	52,575	100.0	54.2	13.7	32.0
Libraries	65,792	100.0	2.8	3.7	93.6
Museums	10,101	100.0	17.8	9.9	72.4
Fellowships	20,165	100.0	18.6	3.5	77.9
Capital expenditures	154,932	100.0	67.1	.9	31.9
Public service	20,237	100.0	30.2	10.5	59.3
Other	37,966	100.0	9.5	15.9	74.6
Total	1,958,368	100.0	8.7	2.4	88.9
MINIMUM-VALUE ESTIMATE					
Instruction	934,841	100.0	1.5	1.8	96.8
Research	34,335	100.0	54.2	13.7	32.2
Libraries	40,705	100.0	2.9	3.5	93.6
Museums	6,689	100.0	17.9	9.5	72.6
Fellowships	13,117	100.0	18.3	3.5	78.2
Capital expenditures	86,815	100.0	66.3	.9	32.8
Public service	12,346	100.0	30.2	10.0	59.8
Other	21,942	100.0	10.5	16.9	72.6
Total	1,149,643	100.0	8.7	2.6	88.8

Table 7

Alternate Estimates of FY80 Humanities Expenditures, by Use and Source:
Private Institutions (N=1,119)

(Dollars in Thousands)

Use of Funds	Total		Restricted Government & Private	All Other Government & Private	All Other
	\$	%			
CONVENTIONAL ESTIMATE					
Instruction	731,275	100.0	2.4	1.8	95.9
Research	19,629	100.0	59.8	7.2	33.0
Libraries	67,422	100.0	5.6	6.1	88.2
Museums	6,639	100.0	17.7	17.3	65.1
Fellowships	35,130	100.0	7.3	9.0	83.7
Capital expenditures	26,855	100.0	4.8	34.7	60.5
Public service	9,310	100.0	28.1	18.8	53.0
Other	49,455	100.0	1.1	10.4	88.5
Total	945,716	100.0	4.3	4.1	91.5
MINIMUM-VALUE ESTIMATE					
Instruction	319,915	100.0	2.6	1.9	95.5
Research	9,684	100.0	61.1	7.5	31.4
Libraries	30,705	100.0	5.6	6.0	88.4
Museums	3,354	100.0	16.1	17.8	66.1
Fellowships	17,815	100.0	7.2	9.0	83.8
Capital expenditures	14,194	100.0	5.0	34.7	60.3
Public service	4,628	100.0	28.8	18.2	53.0
Other	22,357	100.0	1.4	11.8	86.8
Total	422,484	100.0	4.7	4.6	90.7

Table 8

Alternate Estimates of FY80 Humanities Expenditures, by Use and Source:
Universities (N=183)

(Dollars in Thousands)

Use of Funds	Total		Restricted Government & Private	All Other Government & Private	All Other
	\$	%			
CONVENTIONAL ESTIMATE					
Instruction	869,687	100.0	2.6	2.5	94.9
Research	58,134	100.0	57.0	12.4	30.6
Libraries	77,403	100.0	5.0	3.7	91.3
Museums	14,885	100.0	16.1	11.7	72.2
Fellowships	49,888	100.0	11.2	7.1	81.7
Capital expenditures	12,228	100.0	3.0	53.1	43.8
Public service	15,288	100.0	35.7	10.3	54.0
Other	40,693	100.0	6.5	19.9	73.5
Total	1,138,207	100.0	6.7	4.7	88.6
MINIMUM-VALUE ESTIMATE					
Instruction	546,941	100.0	2.6	2.5	94.9
Research	36,831	100.0	56.4	12.6	31.1
Libraries	45,589	100.0	4.8	3.5	91.7
Museums	9,122	100.0	16.5	11.1	72.4
Fellowships	28,311	100.0	12.0	6.7	81.3
Capital expenditures	6,892	100.0	3.0	48.5	48.5
Public service	9,592	100.0	35.0	9.4	55.6
Other	22,827	100.0	7.8	20.3	71.9
Total	704,789	100.0	6.7	4.5	89.0

Table 9

Alternate Estimates of FY80 Humanities Expenditures, by Use and Source:
Four-Year Colleges (N=1,197)

(Dollars in Thousands)

Use of Funds	Total		Restricted Government & Private	All Other Government & Private	All Other
	\$	%			
CONVENTIONAL ESTIMATE					
Instruction	1,014,722	100.0	1.4	1.0	97.6
Research	13,737	100.0	50.4	10.4	39.1
Libraries	38,899	100.0	3.7	5.3	91.0
Museums	1,696	100.0	33.4	23.5	43.1
Fellowships	5,407	100.0	13.9	6.0	80.1
Capital expenditures	150,162	100.0	59.3	2.8	37.9
Public service	12,191	100.0	24.4	16.6	59.0
Other	37,987	100.0	4.0	7.8	88.2
Total	1,274,800	100.0	9.2	1.9	88.9
MINIMUM-VALUE ESTIMATE					
Instruction	498,096	100.0	1.4	1.1	97.5
Research	7,036	100.0	52.0	11.3	36.7
Libraries	18,400	100.0	3.3	4.7	92.0
Museums	841	100.0	27.7	26.0	46.3
Fellowships	2,622	100.0	11.5	5.9	82.6
Capital expenditures	83,871	100.0	59.2	2.8	38.0
Public service	6,324	100.0	24.5	16.4	59.1
Other	17,161	100.0	4.9	9.6	85.5
Total	634,352	100.0	10.1	2.0	87.9

Table 10

Alternate Estimates of FY80 Humanities Expenditures, by Use and Source:
Two-Year Colleges (N=1,001)

(Dollars in Thousands)

Use of Funds	Total		Restricted Government & Private	All Other Government & Private	All Other
	\$	%			
CONVENTIONAL ESTIMATE					
Instruction	443,465	100.0	0.4	1.6	98.1
Research	334	100.0	58.9	.1	41.0
Libraries	16,912	100.0	1.8	9.4	88.8
Museums	159	100.0	1.2	0	98.8
Fellowships	0	0	0	0	0
Capital expenditures	19,397	100.0	81.8	.3	17.9
Public service	2,069	100.0	14.9	13.4	71.7
Other	8,741	100.0	*	1.3	98.7
Total	491,076	100.0	3.7	1.8	94.4
MINIMUM-VALUE ESTIMATE					
Instruction	209,719	100.0	0.2	1.7	98.1
Research	152	100.0	58.0	.2	41.8
Libraries	7,421	100.0	1.2	11.2	87.7
Museums	80	100.0	1.3	0	98.7
Fellowships	0	0	0	0	0
Capital expenditures	10,247	100.0	81.8	.3	17.9
Public Service	1,058	100.0	14.9	13.3	71.8
Other	4,310	100.0	*	1.5	98.5
Total	232,986	100.0	3.9	2.0	94.1

*Less than 0.05 percent

Appendix A: Pretest Instructions

American Council on Education
Higher Education Panel Survey No. 56:

RESTRICTED SUPPORT FOR THE HUMANITIES P R E T E S T INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

1. This survey is intended to record only external support, defined here as all revenues generated outside the institution, its affiliated branches, institutes, and research centers. External support includes: government grants and contracts; private gifts, grants, and contracts; bequests; special trusts; and government appropriations which are non-recurring and restricted in purpose. External support does not include: tuition and fees; endowment income; sales and services of educational activities; sales and services of auxiliary enterprises; sales and services of hospitals; and recurring, unrestricted government appropriations.
2. Only funds received by or pledged to the institution during fiscal year 1980 should be recorded. Fiscal year is defined here as that twelve-month period which the institution normally employs for financial reporting and record-keeping.
3. Only those funds should be recorded which have been restricted entirely or primarily for activities in the humanities. Restricted funds are defined here as externally-generated funds given the institution with specific conditions attached by the grantor regarding their use. Funds are considered to have been used to support the humanities if their restriction refers to or is primarily concerned with one or more of the following fields of study: language, either modern or ancient; linguistics; literature, history; jurisprudence (legal theory rather than professional law study); philosophy; anthropology; archaeology; comparative religion; history and philosophy of religion; ethics; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; American studies; history and philosophy of science; ethnic and women's studies, and political theory.
4. An award should be recorded under the "Use" category which most closely corresponds to its primary intended purpose.
5. Funds recorded should be received or pledged in fiscal year 1980, but need not be expended in that year. Similarly, funds generated in 1980 from a gift, grant, or contract made previously should not be recorded.

For example:

- o In 1973, a bequest of \$500,000 was left to the university for the purpose of endowing a chair of philosophy. Interest from the original bequest continued, in 1980, to support the chair. The interest accrued should not be recorded for 1980.

- o In 1980, a four-year \$400,000 grant for archaeological research was made to the college, from which \$100,000 per year could be drawn through 1983. The entire \$400,000 should be recorded for 1980.
- o In 1980, an irrevocable pledge of \$10,000 was made to the university for the purpose of purchasing books on German literature for the library. The money would not be available until the death of the donor and the execution of his will. The entire \$10,000 should be recorded for 1980.

6. Revocable bequests should not be recorded.

Notes on Sources and Uses of Support

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Column 1 Individuals: Alumni

Persons, living or deceased, who have attended or earned a degree from the institution.

Column 2 Individuals: Non-alumni

All other persons, living or deceased.

Column 3 Foundations

A foundation is defined by the Foundations Center's Foundation Directory (New York: 1979, p. ix) as:

"non-governmental, non-profit organizations with funds (usually from a single source, either an individual, a family or a corporation) and programs managed by its own trustees or directors established to maintain or aid social, educational, charitable, religious or other activities serving the common welfare, primarily through the making of grants."

Note that corporate foundations are included in this category. Foreign foundations should be entered in Column 8.

Column 4 Government: Federal

Departments, agencies, and offices of the U.S. Federal government and the Armed Forces, including the National Endowment for the Humanities, state humanities committees (affiliated with NEH), the National Science Foundation, the National Historic Publications and Records Commission, the Institute for Museum Services, the Department of Education, etc.

Column 5 Government: State and Local

All other U.S. governmental units below the Federal level, including county, regional, and municipal bodies.

Column 6 Business

U.S. profit-making companies, corporations, and firms. Grants or gifts from corporate foundations should be entered in Column 3, "Foundations."

Column 7 Religious

Organizations in the U.S. affiliated with a religious denomination, or of a predominantly religious character. Do not include "contributed services" in the form of salaries from religious faculty who receive less than full salary.

Column 8 Foreign

Any government, foundation, corporation, or organization of a foreign country.

Column 9 Other

Includes various professional, philanthropic, civic and public service, and other organizations. Some examples are: The United Negro College Fund; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; United Way; service clubs; and educational and scholarly associations.

USES OF SUPPORT

Line 1 Faculty

All forms of support for an individual faculty member, including endowed chairs, fellowships, visiting professorships, summer research grants, sabbaticals, grants for participation in or travel to conferences and seminars, etc.

Line 2 Research Projects

Collaborative, on-going, or interdisciplinary projects of research in the humanities. Support for the planning and conduct of scholarly conferences and for humanities research institutes should be included. Also, include here support for the editing of scholarly works or other non-publishing activities related to the preparation of scholarly materials.

Line 3 Museum and Library Collection Acquisition

Acquisition of books, periodicals, audio-visual materials, manuscripts, works of art, cultural artifacts, etc. for museums or libraries. Support for such acquisitions should be listed only if the restrictions specify the humanities nature of the objects to be acquired, or if the museum or library which will receive them is of a predominantly humanities orientation. Donated objects should be assigned a fair market value.

Line 4 Museum and Library Cataloging and Preservation

The organization, cataloging, computerization, conservation, and preservation of museum or library collections.

Line 5 Museums and Library Exhibits

The design and installation of humanities exhibits in museums or libraries.

Line 6 Museum and Library: Other

Support for personnel, personnel development, capital expenditures and general support, and public service or educational programming in museums or libraries.

Line 7 Curriculum Development and Implementation

Support for developing new courses, modifying existing courses, revising curricula, and implementing new curricula at undergraduate, graduate, continuing, and elementary and secondary levels.

Line 8 Student Support

Support for research, prizes, scholarships, fellowships, and other humanities-related activities by undergraduate and graduate students.

Line 9 Scholarly Publication

Subvention of university presses, and title subsidies.

Line 10 Public Service Programming

Activities intended to provide non-instructional programs and services to primarily non-academic groups external to the institution. Seminars, lectures, film series, conferences, workshops, and cooperative extension services would be included.

Line 11 TV/Radio

Script and program development, program acquisition, and other electronic media costs related to the humanities. Development of programs for courses in higher education, continuing education, or elementary/secondary institutions should be listed in Line 7.

Line 12 Capital Expenditures

Renovation and construction of physical plant devoted primarily to the humanities, and acquisition of major facilities (e.g., computer systems, automated language teaching labs) for humanities teaching or research. Capital expenditures for libraries or museums should be reported in Line 6.

Line 13 Other

NEH Challenge Grants and the related matching gifts should be included here unless it is possible to apportion the award among other "use" categories.

Appendix B: Survey Instructions

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

March 17, 1982

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL
(202) 833-4757

Dear Higher Education Panel Representative,

Attached is Higher Education Panel survey #56, "Financial Support for the Humanities, FY1980." Sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the survey seeks information on the amounts, sources, and uses of funds for the humanities.

In June 1981, President Reagan called for the creation of a special Task Force on the Arts and Humanities, and he directed it to recommend "methods to increase private support for the arts and humanities." The National Endowment for the Humanities is responding to the President's initiative by developing data on the financial base of the humanities in the United States. These data are intended for use as a resource for planning by the Endowment, philanthropic organizations, and humanities institutions.

The lack of systematic and reliable data on support for the humanities is most acute in the area of higher education, where the greatest portion of Endowment-supported programs is housed. This information is important in aiding the Endowment to better allocate funds among its programs, as well as to direct private foundations and corporations where the greatest program needs lie.

According to the field test, most institutions will be able to provide the requested information from their business and development offices. However, as usual, we leave that judgment to you.

Please understand that your institution's response will be protected to the maximum extent permissible by law. As with all our surveys, the data you provide will be reported in summary fashion only and will not be identifiable with your institution. This survey is authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results comprehensive, reliable, and timely.

Please return the completed questionnaire to us by April 9, 1982. A preaddressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. If you have any questions or problems, please do not hesitate to telephone us collect at (202)833-4757.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Frank J. Atelsek

Frank J. Atelsek
Panel Director

Higher Education Panel Survey No. 56:
Financial Support for the Humanities, FY 1980
Additional Instructions and Definitions

"HUMANITIES" includes the following fields of study: language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history (including history of science); jurisprudence (the theory, history, and philosophy of law, rather than professional legal study); philosophy (including philosophy of science); archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts (excluding performing arts); and those disciplines and interdisciplinary programs which are humanistic in content or method (such as anthropology, American studies, and ethnic and women's studies). However, if a humanities department includes programs not listed above (e.g., composition, grammar), include the entire department.

SECTION I: Income Restricted to the Humanities

Only those funds should be reported which have been restricted entirely or primarily to activities in the humanities. Restricted funds are defined here as externally generated funds given the institution with specific conditions attached by the grantor regarding their use.

Only funds received by or pledged to the institution during fiscal year 1980 (1979-80) should be reported. Fiscal year is defined here as that twelve-month period which the institution normally employs for financial reporting and record-keeping.

Funds reported should be received or pledged in fiscal year 1980, but need not be expended in that year. Similarly, funds generated in 1980 from a gift, grant, or contract made previously should not be reported.

For example:

- In 1980, a four-year \$400,000 grant for archaeological research was made to the college, from which \$100,000 per year could be drawn through 1983. The entire \$400,000 should be reported for 1980.
- In 1980, an irrevocable pledge of \$10,000 was made to the university for the purpose of purchasing books on German literature for the library. The money would not be available until the death of the donor and the execution of his will. The entire \$10,000 should be reported for 1980.
- In 1973, a bequest of \$500,000 was left to the university for the purpose of endowing a chair of philosophy. Interest from the original bequest continued, in 1980, to support the chair. The interest accrued should not be reported for 1980.

SECTION II: Humanities Expenditures from Restricted and Unrestricted Funds

Whereas Section I asks for the amount of *income* restricted to the humanities, Section II Column A asks for the amount of *expenditures* from all sources for the humanities. Therefore, the dollars reported in Section I are not likely to be the same as those reported in Section II.

Only funds expended by the institution during fiscal year 1980 (1979-80) should be reported.

Only direct expenditures should be reported. If your institution's accounting system includes indirect charges, please estimate the share that is direct and report only that figure.

Use of Funds Definitions

Line 1 *Humanities Instruction*

Expenditures of humanities colleges, schools, and departments should be included in line 1. Include expenditures for both credit and noncredit activities. Include expenditures for endowed chairs, visiting professorships, and sabbaticals, as well as support for regular instructional staff. Also include expenditures for departmental research which are not separately budgeted.

Line 2 *Humanities Research*

Projects of externally commissioned or separately budgeted research in the humanities, either individual or collaborative. Include expenditures for: scholarly conferences, humanities research institutes, faculty research grants, and faculty travel to scholarly meetings.

Line 3 *Humanities Libraries: noncapital*

If the institution includes specialized libraries whose collections and activities are predominantly in the humanities, their total expenditures should be reported. For general-purpose libraries, the amount of overall expenditures which were for acquisitions, preservation, cataloging, personnel, and programming in the humanities should be estimated. Capital expenditures for humanities libraries should be reported in line 6.

Line 4 *Humanities Museums: noncapital*

If the institution includes specialized museums whose collections and activities are predominantly in the humanities, their total expenditures should be reported. For other museums, the amount of overall expenditures which were for acquisitions, preservation, cataloging, personnel, and programming in the humanities should be estimated. Capital expenditures for humanities museums should be reported in line 6.

Line 5 *Humanities Graduate Student Scholarships and Fellowships*

Includes grants, stipends, and other forms of support for students engaged in postbaccalaureate study at the institution. Undergraduate student support should be reported in line 8, "All other humanities expenditures," and assistantships should be reported in line 1, "Humanities instruction."

Source of Funds Definitions

Line 1 *Individuals: Alumni*

Persons, living or deceased, who have attended or earned a degree from the institution.

Line 2 *Individuals: Nonalumni*

All other persons, living or deceased.

Line 3 *Foundations*

A foundation is defined by the Foundation Center's *Foundation Directory* (New York: 1979, p. ix) as:

"non-governmental, non-profit organizations with funds (usually from a single source, either an individual, a family or a corporation) and programs managed by its own trustees or directors established to maintain or aid social, educational, charitable, religious or other activities serving the common welfare, primarily through the making of grants."

Note that corporate foundations are included in this category. Foreign foundations should be entered in line 8.

Line 4 *Government: Federal*

Departments, agencies, and offices of the U.S. Federal government and the Armed Forces, including the National Endowment for the Humanities, state humanities committees (affiliated with NEH), the National Science Foundation, the National Historic Publications and Records Commission, the Institute for Museum Services, the Department of Education, etc.

Line 5 *Government: State and Local*

All other government units below the Federal level, including county, regional, and municipal bodies.

Line 6 *Businesses*

U.S. profit-making companies, corporations, and firms. Grants or gifts from corporate foundations should be entered in line 3, "Foundations."

Line 7 *Religious Organizations*

Organizations in the U.S. affiliated with a religious denomination, or of a predominantly religious character. Do not include "contributed services" in the form of salaries from religious faculty who receive less than full salary.

Line 8 *Foreign Governments or Organizations*

Any government, foundation, corporation, or organization of a foreign country.

Line 9 *Other*

Includes various professional, philanthropic, civic and public service, and other organizations. Some examples are: The United Negro College Fund, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, United Way, service clubs, and educational and scholarly associations.

Line 6 *Humanities Capital Expenditures*

Renovation and construction of physical plant devoted primarily to the humanities, and acquisition of major facilities (e.g., computer systems, automated language teaching labs) for humanities teaching.

Line 7 *Humanities Public Service and Media*

Activities intended to provide noninstructional programs and services to primarily nonacademic groups external to the institution. Seminars, lectures, film series, conferences, workshops, and cooperative extension services would be included. Also include script and program development, program acquisition, and other electronic media costs related to the humanities. Development of programs for courses in higher education, continuing education, or elementary/secondary institutions should be listed in line 8, "All other humanities expenditures."

Line 8 *All Other Humanities Expenditures*

If you have any questions or problems, please call the HEP staff collect at (202) 833-4757

Other Reports of the Higher Education Panel American Council on Education

- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minority Students, 1973-74.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 24, January, 1977.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Nonfederal Funding of Biomedical Research and Development: A Survey of Doctoral Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 25, July, 1975.
- Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Major Field Enrollment of Junior-Year Students, 1973 and 1974.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 26, April, 1976.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Student Assistance: Participants and Programs, 1974-75.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 27, July, 1975.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Health Research Facilities: A Survey of Doctorate-Granting Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 28, February, 1976.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Faculty Research: Level of Activity and Choice of Area.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 29, January, 1976.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Young Doctorate Faculty in Selected Science and Engineering Departments, 1975 to 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 30, August, 1976.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Energy Costs and Energy Conservation Programs in Colleges and Universities: 1972-73 and 1974-75.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 31, April, 1977.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Foreign Area Research Support Within Organized Research Centers at Selected Universities, FY 1972 and 1976.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 32, December, 1976.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **College and University Services for Older Adults.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 33, February, 1977.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Production of Doctorates in the Biosciences, 1975-1980: An Experimental Forecast.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 34, November 1977.
- Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Composition of College and University Governing Boards.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 35, August, 1977.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Estimated Number of Student Aid Recipients, 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 36, September, 1977.
- Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **International Scientific Activities at Selected Institutions, 1975-76 and 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 37, January, 1978.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **New Full-Time Faculty 1976-77: Hiring Patterns by Field and Educational Attainment.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 38, March 1978.
- Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Nontenure-Track Science Personnel: Opportunities for Independent Research.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 39, September 1978.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Scientific and Technical Cooperation with Developing Countries, 1977-78.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 40, August 1978.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Special Programs for Female and Minority Graduate Students.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 41, November 1978.
- Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **The Institutional Share of Undergraduate Financial Assistance, 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 42, May 1979.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Young Doctoral Faculty in Science and Engineering: Trends in Composition and Research Activity.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 43, February 1979.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Shared Use of Scientific Equipment at Colleges and Universities, Fall 1978.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 44, November 1979.
- Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Newly Qualified Elementary and Secondary School Teachers, 1977-78 and 1978-79.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 45, February 1980.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Refund Policies and Practices of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 46, February 1980.
- Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Expenditures for Scientific Research Equipment at Ph.D.-Granting Institutions, FY 1978.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 47, March 1980.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Tenure Practices at Four-Year Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 48, July 1980.
- Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Trends in Financial Indicators of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 49, April 1981.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **An Analysis of Travel by Academic Scientists and Engineers to International Scientific Meetings in 1979-80.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 50, February 1981.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1979.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 51, August 1981.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Recruitment and Retention of Full-Time Engineering Faculty, Fall 1980.** Higher Education Report No. 52, October 1981.
- Andersen, Charles J. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Sabbatical and Research Leaves in Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 53, February 1982.
- Atelsek, Frank J. and Andersen, Charles J. **Undergraduate Student Credit Hours in Science, Engineering, and the Humanities, Fall 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 54, June 1982.
- Andersen, Charles J. and Atelsek, Frank J. **An Assessment of College Student Housing and Physical Plant.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 55, October 1982.